# Inception Report

# Study on
# Urban Renewal Policies
# for the
# Urban Renewal Strategy Review

**September 2008**

**Dr. C.K. Law**
**Prof. Joseph C.W. Chan**
**Dr. Ernest W.T. Chui**
**Dr. Y.C. Wong**
**Mr. K.M. Lee**
**Miss Feon L.Y. Chau**

**University of Hong Kong**

**Background**

The conception of the Urban Renewal Authority to replace Land Development Corporation

1    In July 1995, the HK government issued a pubic consultation document on urban renewal which put forward a package of proposals to expedite the process of urban renewal. In June 1996, the HK Government published a policy statement entitled "Urban Renewal in Hong Kong" which proposed, amongst other things, the establishment of a new statutory authority.

2    In the 1999 Policy Address, the Chief Executive announced the establishment of the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) in 2000 to replace the Land Development Corporation (LDC) to implement a new rigorous and comprehensive approach to overcome the problem of urban decay.    The major reasons for setting up the URA to replace LDC were[1]:
- Scarcity of sites for profitable redevelopment
- Lengthy land assembly process
- Inadequate re-housing resources
- The statutory duty of LDC was to carry out redevelopment of buildings only without other functions of urban renewal such as rehabilitation.

The Urban Renewal Authority White Bill

3    On 22 October 1999, the Government gazetted the Urban Renewal Authority White Bill for public consultation.    A sub-committee was established under the House Committee of the Legislative Council (LegCo) to study the White Bill [2].    The Sub-committee recommended and the Administration accepted:
- To adopt a people-oriented approach and to minimize disruption to social network in the urban renewal process, the Administration should critically assess the need to undertake social impact assessment before launching a redevelopment project.
- That protection of heritage should be included[3].

4    There was one diverse view expressed by deputations on the role of the URA, i.e. the "Government/URA should be more proactive and imaginative in terms of planning and resource utilization in solving urban deterioration" versus "the URA should only assume the role of a facilitator and promoter in urban renewal".    Apparently, the spirit of the White Bill was in line with the first approach.

5    There were a number of concerns raised by the Sub-committee and apparently such concerns still linger today.    These concerns include:
- To allow the URA to sell land resumed under the Lands Resumption Ordinance to a private developer makes it difficult to reconcile with the cardinal principle to resume land for a public purpose.
- The level of compensation – the 10-year old standard used by the LDC and suggestions from 5-year old standard to a new flat.

---

[1]  Report for the House Committee meeting on 11 February 2000, "Report of the Subcommittee to study the Urban Renewal Authority White Bill".
[2]  *Ibid.*
[3]  The Administration accepted the Legislative Council Members' suggestion to revise the clause 5 of the White Bill to expressly provide for the preservation of historical, cultural and architectural sites and structures as one of the purposes.    We noted that the emphasis was on the physical sites and structures.

6    The Sub-committee also noted the division of work between the Building Authority (BA) and the proposed URA, while the URA would be responsible for the urban renewal in the nine action areas, the BA would be responsible for the implementation of a preventive maintenance strategy in other areas.

The Urban Renewal Authority Bill

7    The URA Blue Bill was gazetted on 3 February 2000.   The provisions of the Blue Bill were essentially the same as those of the White Bill except on some drafting and technical points.   Again, the level of compensation was one of the hottest issues debated at the Bills Committee and at the resumption of second reading.

8    On June 26, 2000, the second reading of the URA Bill was resumed.   LegCo members expressed the following wishes and concerns and, apparently, these issues still exist in the current discussion related to urban renewal:

- The level of compensation: most of LegCo members who had spoken commented on this issue and requested a higher level of compensation.
- The Chinese name of URA (市區重建局) suggested that the emphasis was still on redevelopment instead of a balance approach of urban renewal.
- More emphasis on preservation, e.g. instead of individual buildings, conservation of the whole street, whole area or whole terrace should be considered.
- Plot ratio transfer should be considered to make preservation of private buildings possible.
- While there were doubts about the possibility of completing 200 projects in 20 years, there were also demands for faster rate of redevelopment.
- The resettlement of residents in the same district particularly the old people.
- The resettlement of tenants, particularly those not meeting the eligibility criteria of the Housing Authority.
- The partnership between the URA and developers and the strengthening of the alleged image of "interest transfer" (官商勾結).
- The role of the URA, e.g. facilitator role only, assembling land and sell it to developers only, etc.
- Whether the self-financing principle is necessary or feasible.
- The composition of the URA Board, i.e. purely appointed by the Chief Executive.
- The inadequacy of appeal procedures for the URA projects.
- The transparency of the URA operations.

9    On third reading, the Bill was passed with only two objections from the Hon. Christine Loh and Hon. Leung Yiu-chung.   Loh's objection was primarily on the role of the URA. She preferred a more market-led approach of urban renewal instead of having a public body to be "an equity risk partner in development."[4]   Leung's dissatisfaction was mainly concerned with the coercive land resumption power spelt out in the URA Bill, the lack of an urban renewal strategy prior to passing the Bill, and the compensation package proposed by the Administration.

The Urban Renewal Strategy

10   Section 20 of the URAO (Chapter 563) requires the Secretary for Planning and Lands to

---

[4]  Hanzard, Legislative Council, June 26, 2000.

consult the public before finalizing the Urban Renewal Strategy (URS). The consultation took place between August 1, 2001 and September 30, 2001. On the basis of the comments received from over a hundred submissions, the draft URS was revised and subsequently published in November 2001. It spells out the principles, objectives of urban renewal, and the targets, the role of URA, the land assembly process, the processing of projects including the social impact assessment, financial arrangement, parameters and guidelines. Lastly, it spells out that the "urban renewal strategy will be reviewed and updated regularly (every two or three years). The public will be consulted on the revised urban renewal strategy before it is finalized for implementation."

11    The URS requires the URA to adopt a "comprehensive and holistic approach to rejuvenate older urban areas by way of redevelopment, rehabilitation and heritage preservation". Basing on the URS, the URA has established its 4Rs strategy, namely:

- to accelerate Redevelopment by replacing old buildings with new to provide a better living environment and neighbourhood;
- to enable and encourage the Rehabilitation of dilapidated buildings to prevent urban decay;
- to pReserve by maintaining and restoring buildings of historical and architectural value, and to sustain local characteristics;
- to Revitalise through enhancing and strengthening the socio-economic and environmental fabric for the benefit of our urban communities.

**The key issues affecting the urban renewal process in Hong Kong**

12    The objective of this study is to examine the overseas urban renewal experience and to identify lessons and options that are relevant and applicable to the Hong Kong context to address the urban renewal issues and problems to be used for discussion purposes during the public engagement stage. In identifying lessons to learn from overseas examples, this study should address the following issues:

The roles of the public sector, private sector, civic society, and the general public in urban renewal

13    The role of the URA in redevelopment has always been a matter of debate ever since the URA White Bill. For instance, on one end, there are advocates for the URA to simply play the role of a facilitator, i.e. enabling the public to redevelop their dilapidated buildings. Alternatively, the URA can perform a reactive or proactive land-assembly function or as it is now performing the planning, design and developer-partnership roles. On the other end, some considered that the URA should be even more proactive and should speed up the pace of redevelopment.

14    While under the principle of "small government, large market" no one would expect that the URA would take up the role of urban renewal solely on its own, not much attention has been paid to the extent to which the private sector or the market has been picking up its pace in urban renewal. While URA is brought in to deal with urban renewal issues when the market fails to deal with the relevant issues adequately, the setting up of the URA was not to address the relevant issues of the market within the private sector. The URA was set up to deal with some of the barriers faced by the LDC but not those of the private sector, though both the LDC and the private sector might have faced similar barriers. Overseas experience

in dealing with similar issues faced by the private sector would be informative.

15    Ever since the formation of the Sub-committee of the House Committee to study the URA White Bill, LegCo members had urged the government to involve the community in planning and implementing urban renewal programmes and it was accepted by the Administration that people-come-first approach should be adopted.   While the URA has stepped up its community engagement process in the past few years, the community (civic society organizations, professional bodies, and people affected) is demanding for higher level of participation in the planning, design, implementation, financing, and ownership of urban renewal process.   On the other hand, owing to the significant financial interests in urban redevelopment projects, there is always a need to strike a balance between the confidentiality of the URA projects and public participation.

16    The role of URA in the rehabilitation of buildings is more assisting and facilitating.   On the other hand, preservation efforts made by the URA had been more administratively directed with a growing community participation in recent efforts.   It is apparent that the role of the public sector versus the roles of other sectors of the society may vary from one dimension of urban renewal to another, namely, redevelopment, rehabilitation, revitalization and preservation.   In particular, the role of the public sector should be reviewed with respect to the different dimensions of urban renewal.   Furthermore, these dimensions continue to develop over time, as evidenced by the increasing emphases in recent years that the community has placed on cityscape, streetscape, repair and maintenance of older buildings, preservation of existing social network as well as revitalization of local economies.

Financing model

17    In line with the objective that the urban renewal programme should be self-financing in the long run, the Government has been providing support to URA in the forms of equity injection and land grants at nominal premium.   However, public expectation has been changing and has significant impact on the future financing model of urban renewal.

18    The major source of income of the URA is derived from the tender value of the assembled land over and above the cost of the redevelopment projects including acquisition and other operating costs.   With the increasing demand on lower development density, particularly on URA projects, this source of income would be likely diminished in the future.

19    The demand for heritage preservation, so as rehabilitation and revitalization, has been mounting.   As evidenced in the LegCo debate during the second reading of the URAO in June 2000, the request for a much broader and extensive conservation efforts was articulated by a number of LegCo members.   At present, preservation efforts done by the URA were considered to be more a "spending" item than a self-financing item.   While during the establishment of the URA there were already worries about the ability of the URA to finance its operations expressed, together with the expected reduction in income from redevelopment and increased spending in preservation, rehabilitation, and probably revitalization, how the URA can maintain its position of self-financing will become an issue.   Models of financing preservation in other cities could serve as an important reference.

20    Another side of the financial equation is the compensation policy: This has always been a contentious debate on this issue in HK as in elsewhere.   This issue involved many other related issues such as public housing policy, land policy, development rights, etc.   This has

been the major issue in the formulation of the URAO back in 2000. At the time of the LDC, the compensation was equivalent to a 10-year old flat and subsequently upgraded to a 7-year old flat as a political compromise made during the establishment of the URA. The request for "flat for flat", "shop for shop" and "owners' participation scheme" was mentioned from time to time. The issue of "fair and reasonable compensation" should be revisited during this URS review.

Diverse views on urban renewal

21 The majority view is not always obvious. While there are individuals and groups that fight against almost any form of demolition and would like to keep everything in their status quo as far as possible, there are also individuals and groups that favour redevelopment and emphasize efficiency of project implementation and economic value of land. Different stakeholders also hold different views as in many cases of urban redevelopment, e.g. owner-occupiers of residential units tend to prefer redevelopment while operators of shops prefer rehabilitation. Community engagement process and urban renewal policies that are conducive to ironing out these differences would be crucial for urban renewal to achieve its missions.

Sustainable urban development

22 The interrelatedness of the economic, social and environment concerns shape modern urban development and urban renewal policies, with the social dimension growing into almost equal importance as the economic and environmental dimensions. While the social impact assessment has been adopted as a prerequisite for a URAO redevelopment project, urban redevelopment programmes of the URA are still frequently seen as destroying the urban fabric and local character as well as the social network. The urban renewal strategy review should also take this issue into account.

The planning and redevelopment process

23 Many owners and tenants are also concerned about the relatively long time taken to go through the planning procedures before the URA commences the acquisition process, and in some existing URA projects, such process has taken several years. Some owners for other reasons cannot wait for that long and subsequently had to give up their flats before the URA makes an offer. Furthermore, it is frequently alleged that tenants were "kicked" out before the URA freezing survey began. There are calls from LegCo members and the public that the URA should start the acquisition process before beginning the planning process.

The pace of urban decay

24 While the existing URS expects the URA to redevelop 2,000 buildings in 20 years, URA has completed redevelopment of 400 buildings in the past 7 years, i.e. substantially below the target. On the other hand, there would be on average 500 buildings in HK each year reaching its end of design life (i.e. 50 years[5]) in the next ten years. The pace of redevelopment in both the private and public sectors lags substantially behind the growing rate of aged buildings. This issue has to be addressed and the appropriate strategies to deal

---

[5] The design life of 50 years does not mean that the buildings can only last for 50 years. With proper maintenance, "life expectancy" of buildings can be substantially extended.

with this issue have to be derived in the coming review of URS.

<u>The coverage of the scope of work of the URA</u>

25   At the time of setting up of the URA, nine target areas were identified and beyond which it would be the responsibility of the Building Authority to implement a preventive rehabilitation programme.   On one hand, it is apparent that the issue of urban renewal is faced by all parts of urban Hong Kong to different extents.   On the other hand, priority setting is always a matter of policy and administrative decision.   The process of identification and selection of priority target areas could be an issue to be reviewed.

**International Urban Renewal Policy and Practice**

26   We planned to study six cities, namely, Seoul of South Korea, Tokyo of Japan, Singapore, Taipei, Shanghai and Guangzhou of the Mainland.

27   The above cities differ in terms of urban development history, political structure, political culture, institutional setup in urban renewal, land policy including land use strategy and land title policy.   For instance, in terms of urban development history, Seoul, Shanghai, Guangzhou and Tokyo have a much longer history than that in Hong Kong.   Yet, Seoul and Taipei similar to Hong Kong had undergone rapid development since World War II. Singapore and Hong Kong shared one important common characteristics in urban development, which is the massive public housing from the 60's to the 80's, with Singapore in an even much larger extent, i.e. 85% of the Singapore population living in public housing and with 90% ownership in public housing[6].   All the selected cities except Singapore have multiple levels of government with the city government subsumed under the national government.

28   Furthermore, urban renewal is seen very differently in the various cities.   For example, Singapore sees it as part of nation development and Japan sees it more as an instrument of economic development.   We recommend including Seoul apart from the five cities listed in the tender, for the development of civic society organizations in Seoul is very similar to HK or perhaps even more radical and militant than their counter parts in HK.

<u>Macao</u>

29   Macao as another case study had been considered by the Research Team.   While Macao has a very comprehensive heritage preservation policy, usually considered as, much advance than that in Hong Kong, it does not have an explicit urban renewal policy, strategy, or the relevant institutional set-up.     While the Macao government appears to be aware of the various issues of urban renewal, given the parameters spelt out for a World Heritage Site, the Macao government is facing a set of conditions that are not faced by Hong Kong Government.   A study on Macao would be primarily a study on heritage preservation instead of urban renewal *per se*.   In view of the above limitations with respect to an empirical study, The Research Team did not recommend including Macao into the overseas case study.

---

[6]  In Singapore, public rental housing only constitutes a small part (i.e. about 10%) of the population within public housing managed by the Housing and Development Board.

Seoul, South Korea

30    Urban renewal has been a contentious issue in the recent few decades in Seoul.    Urban renewal started off in the sixties to clear squatters for development.    Clearance, compensation, resettlement, and even the development of new towns are hot issues arousing frequent conflicts reaching violence level and they are election issues in 2008.    There has been a continuous debate on the division of work between the city government and the national government.    At present, it is the authority of the city government to designate rundown residential districts as sites for urban renewal.

31    In 1989, the temporary legislation, 'The Urban Poor's Housing Environment Improvement Act,' was promulgated in order to improve the housing environment of urban poor neighbourhoods.    This program was intended to resettle more residents by encouraging resident's initiatives for improvement scheme and public sector participation for a clearance scheme.    However, while at the beginning, the government set up the redevelopment program as a means to avoid resistance from the target groups, the program provoked intensive conflicts between the target groups and the government.    Before implementing this program, the government would designate the housing environment improvement districts. The improvement program has two types of redevelopment schemes, that is, individual improvement and multi-family housing development. In the type of individual improvement, the residents redevelop their own houses by themselves.    The government relaxes the building code considerably and provides loans 5-7 million won to each owner for the redevelopment at about half of the average bank loan rates.    The second type of redevelopment programme involves multiple households and is usually the most contentious part of the redevelopment programme owing to issues of titles and potential profit in the real estate market.

Taipei

32    The role of the Government in urban renewal is more focused on revitalization and it serves a facilitating role in urban redevelopment.    The major driving force of urban redevelopment is the Urban Redevelopment Office.    Currently, Taipei's urban redevelopment policy places emphasis on the renewal of strategic districts and housing estates, encouraging the private sector to undertake redevelopment initiatives, the transformation of urban spaces and the establishment of urban redevelopment mechanisms.

33    In the recent "New Community Vision", each community is encouraged to formulate its own vision of development and to devise its own plan of action with the assistance of relevant professionals.    The Taipei City Government assists in aspects of planning and also carries out physical improvement projects for specific communities.

34    Furthermore, the Taipei City Government assists NGOs to establish and operate Community Planning Centers assisting, in turn, the residents of Taipei to carry out community planning.

Tokyo, Japan

35    Urban renewal is seen as a major tool of economic development and is taken seriously by the Japan government at the highest level.  Recent efforts of urban renewal were spearheaded by the government's city revitalization panel formed in 2004 which was chaired

by the Prime Minister and deputized by the Land Minister.   The panel is tasked with crafting an urban renewal plan for the major cities including Tokyo and Osaka, as part of the government's economic stimulus measures through harnessing private-sector partnership.

Singapore

36   As a city state, urban redevelopment is seen as part of the national development programme of Singapore.   The Urban Redevelopment Authority is vested with the authority and responsibility of town planning, land policy, land acquisition, formation and sale, and the implementation of urban renewal programmes.   Government intervention in urban renewal in Singapore can be seen as relatively the most directive as compared to other cities in the proposed study, and the same time the most non-controversial.   With 85% of the population living in public housing estates and with 90% home ownership, housing the public is seen as the primary role of the Singapore government.   The interesting aspects of recent development is the intention to move residents back into the inner city by doubling the population density in the city centre within the next 40 years and its massive conservation efforts in the past two decades.   As at 31 Mar 2008, there are 55 national monuments and over 6,823 buildings conserved.

Shanghai, China

37   Shanghai has witnessed drastic urban transformations in the past 3 decades.   The rapid development of Shanghai has made it having the highest skyline second only to Hong Kong in China.   The concentration of skyscrapers is more obvious within the inner Ring Road and in Pudong.   The emergency of the urban land market in 1992, the massive moving out of over 1 million residents to the outskirts of Shanghai from the inner city, and the presence of construction sites practically everywhere in Shanghai since then are the evidence of the massive redevelopment in the 90's.   Redevelopment in Shanghai has also been a matter issue of controversy and the relocation of residents often to remote suburban areas without adequate compensation had aroused public protest.   The issue of destruction of the social and cultural identity of local communities was raised from time to time.   Before everything would have been gone in another ten years time, in the 90's, the need for preservation and conservation of historical buildings and sites was recognized with, perhaps, the ambitious city "facelift" project to impress visitors coming to the APEC meeting held in 2001. The local Urban Planning Administration Bureau of Shanghai and the Commission of Cultural Relics Management worked together to maintain the balance between development and preservation.

Guangzhou, China

38   Similar to Shanghai, Guangzhou has undergone massive urban development owing to the rapid economic development in the past 3 decades.   Land policy changes after the land reform in 1987 sparkled extensive farm land acquisition on the part of the Guangzhou municipal government and which in turn obtain substantial land premium from leasing of state land.   Urban redevelopment originally under "comprehensive development" scheme is now becoming more market driven by the booming real estate market.   In 1995, the Guangzhou government embarked on an ambitious target to overtake the "four little dragons" in Asia with 15 years.   To achieve this target, the city had to allocate more land to investors, property developers, infrastructure construction and social provisions.   Since 1998, the Guangzhou Government initiated a three-phased urban development strategy aiming to

promote the "greenness, amenity and attractiveness" of the city by embarking on a large number of face lifting and infrastructure projects to wipe out illegal developments, renovate dilapidating streets and buildings, clean-up environment, increase accessibility and provide more open space. Coordination of urban development depends on a complex system of negotiation and collaboration among the Housing and Land Administration Bureau, Civic Affairs Bureau, and the Urban Planning Bureau.

**Approach /methodology of the study and detailed programme**

39  Literature review: This is basically a desk-top study of existing research literature available in journals, conference proceedings, books, and material in the internet and websites.

40  Discussion with the Steering Committee, the URA, the Development Bureau, and the relevant government officials who have participated in the previous development of the URS.

41  Participating in the Public Engagement process: this Research Team will work closely with the Public Engagement Team throughout the whole URS review process. Specifically, the Research Team will serve as observer in the focus groups as far as possible, assist in the planning of the overseas study visit, making recommendations to the organization of the whole day seminar initially scheduled on December 15, 2008, and provide input to the preparation of information pack for the public engagement stage.

42  Link and collaboration with academics and universities of the various cities: the Research Team will make use of its existing, and if necessary establish new, academic network in the various countries to assist in data collection. Owing to the limited documentation available in Japan, the Research Team will collaborate with Prof. On-kwok Lai[7], School of Kwansei Gakuen University to conduct the field study in Tokyo of Japan.

43  Study visit: Field visits to each of the city would be conducted by the research team. Not all the policy documents can be obtained via the internet or email communications with the relevant parties. In the case of Tokyo and Seoul, documentations that are available in English or in Chinese can be quite limited. Study visit will be quite essential. The visit will enable collection of some of the documents that may not be available online and interviews with various stakeholders can be conducted. Photos of selected urban renewal projects can also be taken to illustrate the visual impact of urban renewal on the project sites. Various stakeholders include:
- the key officials of implementation agency (public sector): these may involve two to four individuals from more than one public body/bureau/department depending on the complexity of the institutional set-up
- the key stakeholders: it may involve several individuals or groups including academics, professionals, key personnel of advocacy groups in the area of urban renewal, representatives from the private sector participating in the chosen urban renewal projects.
- affected parties: representatives of residents or business operators affected in a chosen urban renewal project. Depending on the types of urban renewal programmes in the city chosen, more than one urban renewal project may be chosen, e.g. a revitalization, a rehabilitation and a redevelopment programme, etc

---

[7] Professor Lai was both trained in social work and urban studies.

depending on the representativeness and significance of the project.

44   In both the literature review and study visit, the following areas will be studied:
- Institutional arrangements in formulating and implementing urban renewal policies;
- Statutory and executive power of implementation agencies and its composition of the board and public accountability;
- Land law and administration related to land ownership/tenure in the context of planning and development, the policy approach and powers to enable property acquisition or resumption;
- Financial model of urban renewal, financial arrangement of implementation agencies, and other financial instruments (e.g. tax relief or tax incentives);
- Relative emphasis on different types of urban renewal (i.e. redevelopment, rehabilitation, revitalization and preservation);
- Role of the public sector (planner/facilitator/developer/etc.), business sector, NGOs, and the affected bodies;
- Approaches used in different types of urban renewal including initiation of project, community participation, and financing;
- Approaches used in various types of urban renewal (e.g. voluntary/statutory)
- Compensation and re-housing policies;
- Community engagement processes (statutory/non-statutory);
- Community involvement in shaping the content, mode, land use, conservation, development intensity and scale of urban renewal projects; and
- Such other issues as Development Bureau and URA may suggest.

45   Apart from identifying "what" the above answers are and "how" the above can be achieved, it is also important to find out "why" these are done and can be done.   The value basis, the political structure and culture in these cities, and the dynamics and power relationship among various stakeholders are important dimensions that we have to look into before we can assess the extent to which these overseas examples can serve as reference of urban renewal in HK.

46   Evidence of cost, effectiveness, and efficiency will also be collected and analyzed in the study.   Such evidence can be obtained from research studies if available, interviews with stakeholders and media reports.

47   The time table of study is as follows

|  | Target date |
| --- | --- |
| Finalize study programme | August, 2008 |
| Literature review | August, 2008 – September 2008 |
| Develop contact with various bodies overseas and arrange field visits and interviews | August, 2008 – mid-October, 2008 |
| Conduct field visits | Early November, 2008 |
| Draft working paper on international experience and project study report | Early November, 2008 |
| Finalize invitations of speakers | Late October, 2008 |
| Assist in organizing overseas study visit | November, 2008 |
| Participate in public engagement process | October, 2008 onwards |
| Finalize working paper | December, 2008 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Draft final report | January 2009 |
| Input to information pack for public engagement stage | December 2008 – January 2009 |
| Complete final report | February, 2009 |

**Urban Renewal Strategy Review**
**Urban Renewal Policies**
**HKU Research Team**

| Role | Name | Division of work |
|---|---|---|
| Principal Investigator | Dr Law, Chi-kwong | Project director responsible for the project.   Also will be the key investigator in the case of Seoul, South Korea, and Singapore |
| Co-Investigator | Prof Chan, Cho-wai, Joseph | Assisting in the development of the study framework, literature review, data collection, and drafting of report, in particular, the key investigators in the case of Taipei |
| Co-Investigator | Miss Feon Chau | |
| Co-Investigator | Dr Chui, Wing-tak, Ernest | Assisting in the development of the study framework, literature review, data collection, and drafting of report, in particular, the key investigators in the case of Tokyo, Japan |
| Co-Investigator | Dr Wong, Yu-cheung | Assisting in the development of the study framework, literature review, data collection, and drafting of report, in particular, the key investigators in the case of Shanghai & Guangzhou |
| Co-Investigator | Mr Lee, Kar-mut, Carmel | |
| Project Manager | Miss HO, Lai-shan, Lisa | Assist Dr. Law in managing and coordinating the project |
| Research Assistants | Miss Ng Pui-ling, Anna and one other Research Assistant will be joining the team at the end of August | Assisting in literature review, data collection, and drafting of report. |

**Final Report – Tentative Chapter outline**

|  |  | 1<sup>st</sup> draft by | Team Deadline | Submission deadline |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chapter 1 | Existing Urban Renewal Strategy in Hong Kong – Background and Issues | C.K. Law | 11/8 | 15/8 |
| Chapter 2 | Study Methodology and Framework | C.K. Law | 11/8 | 15/8 |
| Chapter 3 | The case of Singapore | C.K. Law | 31/10 | 15/11 |
| Chapter 4 | The case of Tokyo, Japan | Ernest Chui | 31/10 | 15/11 |
| Chapter 5 | The case of Seoul, South Korea | C.K. Law | 31/10 | 15/11 |
| Chapter 6 | The case of Taipei | Joseph Chan & Feon Chau | 31/10 | 15/11 |
| Chapter 7 | The case of Shanghai | Y.C. Wong & K.M. Lee | 31/10 | 15/11 |
| Chapter 8 | The case of Guangzhou | Y.C. Wong & K.M. Lee | 31/10 | 15/11 |
| Chapter 9 | Summary and comparison of the six cities relevant to the context of Hong Kong | C.K. Law | 15/11 | 15/11 |
| Chapter 10 | Lessons learnt, conclusions and recommendations | C.K. Law | 10/12 | 31/12 |